Morbidity & Mortality Rounds as Epistemic Practice: A Critical Interpretive Synthesis

Paula Rowland¹, Nathan Cupido¹, Mathieu Albert¹, Simon Kitto²

¹. Wilson Centre
². University of Ottawa

Paula.rowland@uhn.ca

Introduction: Morbidity and mortality rounds (MMRs) are a learning practice that have been a part of medicine for more than 100 years. More recently, MMRs have become a site of interest for educators, hospital administrators, and governing bodies. As such, MMRs occupy a hybrid organizational space with multiple accountabilities. To date, there have been few examinations of processes of learning as they are emerging in new iterations of MMRs, specifically how those logics of learning are interacting, complicating, or confounding one another.

Methods: To address this conceptual problem, we conducted a review of the literature on MMRs using a critical interpretive approach. The aim of the review was to document how MMRs are constructed in the published literature and to interpret what those constructions imply about the nature of professional knowledge and learning within hybrid organizational spaces.

Findings: Current literature reflects a wide range of competing imperatives manifesting in the design, delivery, and evaluation of MMRs. Some scholars have reflected on the possible implications of a single learning practice attempting to serve both individual learning needs and organizational performance requirements. Despite this, there have been few empirical studies of the potential impact of these multiple imperatives acting on a single learning practice.

Discussion: MMRs serve as an ideal site to explore the epistemic interactions between individuals, organizations, professions, and policy-makers. Understanding how knowledge is produced, contested and maintained across these boundaries is increasingly important for educators seeking to support clinical learning environments and lifelong learning in clinical workplaces.